

Document Log Item		Release-Redaction	
Notice: this template will become DEPRECATED as EPA exits Lotus Notes for e-mail. Replacement tool information can be found at this link: http://intranet.epa.gov/ediscovery/			
Addressing			
From		To	
Ruth Chemerys/DC/USEPA/US		James Curtin/DC/USEPA/US@EPA	
CC		BCC	
Sarah Furtak/DC/USEPA/US@EPA Michael Haire/DC/USEPA/US@EPA			
Description		Form Used: Reply	
Subject		Date/Time	
Re: Review requested by 2:30: Draft response to Kalispel		07/05/2012 11:09 AM	
# of Attachments	Total Bytes	NPM	Contributor
4	93,281		James Curtin
Processing			
Comments			
<p>X</p> <p>Jim's email needs to be redacted, the other emails can be released. The "agenda" documents can be released; The earliest "response" document is deliberative but I am not sure there is harm in releasing. Jim's "response" attachment is attorney client privileged, but it is very similar to the final though the edits are visible. I am not sure there would be harm in releasing. HR</p> <p>KO - I think you mean redact Ruth's message back to Jim? The top message should be redacted. The agendas can be released. The "response" documents - recommend comparing to what actually went to the Tribe.</p> <p>Released in folder "Chemerys_Curtin_7_5_12"</p>			
<input type="text"/> Clear Category		<input type="text"/> Non-responsive <input type="text"/>	
Release-Redaction			
<input type="checkbox"/> Printed			

Body

Document Body

Jim--

I was a little confused by your edit indicating that we would be happy to discuss the the 3 assumptions posed by the Tribe. I had thought we discussed indicating that we would be willing to listen to the Tribe's own thoughts on those assumptions, but not that we'd have a discussion. I'm a little concerned about turning the meeting into a discussion of those assumptions, rather than listening to the Tribe's view on technical issues. It seems that by offering a discussion of these broad policy issues, it changes the scope of what we had agreed to originally.

Ruth

James Curtin	Sarah - Here are my edits to both documents. L...	07/05/2012 01:38:20 PM
--------------	---	------------------------

From: James Curtin/DC/USEPA/US
To: Sarah Furtak/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Felicia Wright/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael Haire/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ruth Chemerys/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lee Schroer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tod Siegal/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/05/2012 01:38 PM
Subject: Re: Review requested by 2:30: Draft response to Kalispel

Sarah - Here are my edits to both documents. Let me know if you have any questions. - Jim

Tod - Feel free to add anything you like to this letter and draft agenda for a meeting OW is having later this month with a tribe to hear what the tribe thinks about a Washington State TMDL and whether Region 10 should approve it. If you can get any edits to Sarah by mid-afternoon, she would appreciate it. She's trying to get it to the tribe today, if possible. Thanks. - Jim



jul_5_2012_draft_response_to_kalispel.jc.docx



jul_5_2012_mark_up_kalispel_agenda_draft.jc.docx

James Curtin
Office of General Counsel
202.564.5482
Mail Code: 2355A
curtin.james@epa.gov

Sarah Furtak

deliberative draft Dear Jim & Felicia,

07/05/2012 11:33:14 AM

From: Sarah Furtak/DC/USEPA/US
To: James Curtin/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Felicia Wright/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Michael Haire/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ruth Chemerys/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/05/2012 11:33 AM
Subject: Review requested by 2:30: Draft response to Kalispel

deliberative draft

Dear Jim & Felicia,

Attached below, please find a draft, deliberative response to Kalispel Tribe's email/request of June 29.

I will plan to share this with my Acting Branch Chief this afternoon, and then share it with Region 10 for a very quick review this afternoon prior to responding to Kalispel Tribe.

Your input by 2:30 pm Eastern would be most helpful in track changes format.

Thanks,

Sarah
202 566 1167



jul_5_2012_draft_response_to_kalispel.docx



jul_5_2012_mark_up_kalispel_agenda_draft.docx
